

Remarks

Applicant respectfully states that Claims 1, 7-9 and 15 are amended herein. Claims 1-25 remain pending in the Application.

Rejection under 103(a)

Claims 1-25

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rumbaugh (6275144) in view of Weiss et al. (6469103). Applicant has reviewed the Rumbaugh reference in view of Weiss et al. and respectfully asserts that Rumbaugh in view of Weiss et al. does not teach or render obvious the claimed embodiments of the present invention for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully states that Independent Claims 1, 9 and 15 recite the feature "one or more network servers, each connected with one or more of said powered, intelligent, multiplexing devices, each connection via a single industry standard communications cable..." Support for the Claimed feature can be found throughout the Figures and Specification including page 10 lines 15-20.

The features stated above are different than Rumbaugh for the following rationale. Applicant understands Rumbaugh to teach a method for transmitting data over power lines. That is, Applicant understands Rumbaugh to teach powerline networking which uses power lines existing in the home. Applicant does not understand Rumbaugh to teach, suggest, or provide any motivation for networking using industry standard communications cable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Rumbaugh does not teach or render obvious the features of Claims 1, 9 and 15.

Moreover, Applicant does not understand the teachings of Weiss et al. to overcome the shortcomings of Rumbaugh. Applicant understands Weiss et al. to teach a method for providing power in a secure manner to a network device

connected to a network. Therefore, Applicant does not understand the teachings of Weiss et al. also do not provide a suggestion or motivation for networking using industry standard communications cable.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Weiss et al. in combination with Rumbaugh does not teach or render obvious the features of Claims 1, 9 and 15 and, as such, Claims 1, 9, and 15 traverse the Examiner's basis for rejections under 35 USC 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Rumbaugh alone or in combination with Weiss et al. also does not teach or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 2-8, 10-14 and 16-25 which depend from Independent Claims 1, 9, and 15 and that these Claims are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base Claims.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully states that Independent Claims 1, 9 and 15 recite the feature "one or more powered, intelligent, multiplexing devices providing an access control point, said one or more powered, intelligent, multiplexing devices further automatically providing a tamper alert signal to a network management source in the event of a physical breach.." Support for the Claimed features can be found throughout the Figures and Specification including page 13 line 14 through page 14 line 7.

The features stated above are different than Rumbaugh for the following rationale. Applicant does not understand Rumbaugh to teach one or more powered, intelligent, multiplexing devices providing an access control point. In addition, Applicant does not understand Rumbaugh to teach one or more powered, intelligent, multiplexing devices further automatically providing a tamper alert signal to a network management source in the event of a physical breach. That is, Applicant understands Rumbaugh to teach a standard router configuration with no alert signal in the event of a physical breach. Applicant does not understand Rumbaugh to teach, suggest, or provide any motivation for

providing a router with said physical breach alarm capabilities. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Rumbaugh does not teach or render obvious the features of Claims 1, 9 and 15.

Moreover, Applicant does not understand the teachings of Weiss et al. to overcome the shortcomings of Rumbaugh. Applicant understands Weiss et al. to teach a method for providing power in a secure manner to a network device connected to a network. Therefore, Applicant does not understand the teachings of Weiss et al. also do not provide a suggestion or motivation for monitoring the security of the network and providing an alert signal in the event of a physical breach.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Weiss et al. in combination with Rumbaugh does not teach or render obvious the features of Claims 1, 9 and 15 and, as such, Claims 1, 9, and 15 traverse the Examiner's basis for rejections under 35 USC 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Rumbaugh alone or in combination with Weiss et al. also does not teach or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 2-8, 10-14 and 16-25 which depend from Independent Claims 1, 9, and 15 and that these Claims are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base Claims.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully states that Independent Claims 1 and 15 recite the feature "one or more network administrator consoles, each network administration console implementing and managing said access control point of said one or more powered, intelligent, multiplexing devices..." Support for the Claimed features can be found throughout the Figures and Specification including page 14 line 14 through page 15 line 7.

The features stated above are different than Rumbaugh for the following rationale. Applicant does not understand Rumbaugh to teach one or more

network administrator consoles, each network administration console implementing and managing said access control point of said one or more powered, intelligent, multiplexing devices. Instead, Applicant understands Rumbaugh to teach a standard router configuration. Applicant does not understand Rumbaugh to teach, suggest, or provide any motivation for providing a network administrator console for implementing and managing said access control point of said one or more powered, intelligent, multiplexing devices. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Rumbaugh does not teach or render obvious the features of Claims 1 and 15.

Moreover, Applicant does not understand the teachings of Weiss et al. to overcome the shortcomings of Rumbaugh. Applicant understands Weiss et al. to teach a method for providing power in a secure manner to a network device connected to a network. Therefore, Applicant does not understand the teachings of Weiss et al. also do not provide a suggestion or motivation for implementing and managing said access control point of said one or more powered, intelligent, multiplexing devices.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Weiss et al. in combination with Rumbaugh does not teach or render obvious the features of Claims 1 and 15 and, as such, Claims 1 and 15 traverse the Examiner's basis for rejections under 35 USC 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Rumbaugh alone or in combination with Weiss et al. also does not teach or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 2-8 and 16-25 which depend from Independent Claims 1 and 15 and that these Claims are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base Claims.

Conclusion


In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-25.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: _____

9/6/05



John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060